Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/684,805	MAENISHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James G. Barrow	3749	

All Participants:

(1) *James G. Barrow*.

(2) *James E. Ledbetter*.

Status of Application: *Election/Restriction*

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: *9 November 2004*

Time: _____

Type of Interview:
- ☒ Telephonic
- ☐ Video Conference
- ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
N/A

Claims discussed:
1-17

Prior art documents discussed:
N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Ira S. Lazarus
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700

(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In response to the Examiner's Election/Restriction requirement mailed on 8/23/2004Applicant's Representative elected Group II, claims 1-16, cancelled claim 17, and amended the preamble of claims 1-16 with the phrase "hydrogen generator". In the Election/Restriction requirement there were three Groups, Group I claims 1-16 was to a burner, Group II claim 17 was to a hydrogen generator, and Group III was to a fuel cell power generation system. Examiner called the Representative for clarification as to why the Representative selected Group II but instead of claim 17 selected claims 1-16. The Representative considers inserting the phrase "hydrogen generator" into the preamble of claims 1-16 makes the claims to a hydrogen generator". The Examiner pointed out to the Representative that inserting the phrase "hydrogen generator" into the preamble does not make the claims to a hydrogen generator. It was also pointed out to the Representative that the reason why claim 17 was to a hydrogen generator was not just the phrase "hydrogen generator" but also the paragraph claiming structure to a reformer. The Representative maintains the Applicant wants to prosecute the invention of a hydrogen generator, that claims 1-16 are to a hydrogen generator, and that claims 1-16 belong in Group II. This call did not result in agreement. .